HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 36 Saturday, September 7, 1957 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

FEDERAL AID: *The Education Lobby*.....(page 1)
WHITE HOUSE: *Hurley vs. Adams*.....(page 1)
CIVIL RIGHTS: *Milwaukee omen*.....(page 2)
BUREAUCRATS: *Ike tips their hand*.....(page 2)
IMMIGRATION: *Patriots mobilize*.....(page 3)

Federal Aid to Education: Despite their recent abortive attempt to ram through a bill for Federal funds for local education, the forces backing "Federal aid to education" returned to the fray early this week — in what is regarded as one of the most impudent lobbying activities seen in the Capital in many years.

The lobbying offensive commenced with the appearance in various newspapers of a syndicated interview (by the Newspaper Enterprise Association) with Lawrence G. Derthick, U.S. Commissioner of Education. Derthick promised that "the fight for Federal aid for school construction will continue in spite of the defeat his proposal recently suffered in Congress." The newly appointed Commissioner of Education — according to the newspaper syndicate — "gained national prominence in the field of education by extensive speechmaking around the country to teachers' groups. It's this speaking ability which he intends to throw behind the school-aid program."

This statement stirred strong reactions among those who only four weeks ago helped beat the Federal aid bill in the House of Representatives. They see in it the first shot in a massive and well-planned propaganda campaign to put over Federal education assistance when Congress assembles again four months hence.

The Derthick utterance also seems admirably timed to capitalize on the confusion which always attends the opening of schools throughout the Nation in early September. For, the Newspaper Enterprise Association news break offers an opportunity to local fanatics of the "Federal aid" type to propagandize harassed parents and make them receptive to legislation for grants in aid to local educational authorities.

Swift and scathing reaction to Derthick's pledge of a fight for Federal aid came from Representative Ralph Gwinn (R.-N.Y.), leader in House battles against Federal aid proponents. The New York legislator, reached in his district by HUMAN EVENTS on the telephone, exclaimed: "It is outrageous of Derthick to make such a statement. It is not his function as Commissioner to spread propaganda on a controversial issue like this and to organize from within the Government at the taxpayers' expense.

"It is especially reprehensible of him to do so, in view of the fact that, before recently taking the job of Commissioner, he served on the lobbying committee of the National Education Association, one of the best-heeled lobbying groups in the Nation's Capital."

Gwinn was referring to the well-known fact that the "Legislative Committee" of the National Education Association is devoted, among other things, to lobbying for Federal aid to education. Before coming to Washington, Derthick was a very active member of this committee. Gwinn bluntly warned Derthick to stop his lobbying activities, which are specifically prohibited by Federal law (18 U.S.C. 1913).

Inside the White House: In the wake of the bitterly argued McKinney affair, HUMAN EVENTS can report some vivid illustrations of what is wrong with the Eisenhower Administration, showing: (1) how important information is kept from the President; (2) how Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams autocratically runs the White House; and (3) how secret deals are made by the "autocrat" in cahoots with Democrats.

The McKinney affair (see last week's item on this matter) concerns the appointment by the Eisenhower Administration of Robert McKinney, New Mexico publisher and a New Deal Democrat who campaigned for Adlai Stevenson against Ike. Many Republicans knew nothing about this until it was announced. Former Secretary of War (under Hoover) Patrick J. Hurley, a power in the GOP in New Mexico, hastened to Washington to protest. Details of what he found out in the Executive Mansion have come to HUMAN EVENTS from friends of the General, as follows:

Hurley easily got in to see Ike, for they have known each other for thirty years, ever since Pat was Secretary of War in Hoover's cabinet.

He said: "Dwight, would the name McKinney mean anything to you?" The President replied: "No. Should it?" Then Hurley opened up and told the President how McKinney campaigned against Ike's election in 1952, how he lambasted Ike, expressing the lowest opinion of Ike's abilities and fitness for the Presidency — all the while extolling the superior virtues of Adlai Stevenson. Hurley wound up: "And this is the man the Republican Administration has appointed!" The President said wearily: "Thanks very much, Pat, for telling me. I'll look into it."

When Hurley emerged from the Presidential office, Sherman Adams bore down on him and, without any ceremony, curtly demanded: "Go right into that room and dictate to the stenographer an account of what you and the President said." As friends remark: "No one can talk that way to Pat." The General looked sidewise at Adams and, in the vernacular of an old soldier, told him to "go to." He added: "I challenge you to walk

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into Dwight's office and ask him what we said." Then, turning on his heel, he walked out of the White House.

The upshot of these incidents was a meeting of protesting party and Congressional leaders in the White House with Sherman Adams and the President. There the angry Republicans learned that a deal had been made, months ago, between Adams and Democratic Senate Leader Lyndon Johnson.

Adams wanted the support of Clinton Anderson (D.-N.M.), leading Senate member of the powerful Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, for Ike's "Atoms-for-Peace" treaty — passage of which was very much in doubt. Anderson's support was secured, at a price: appointment of McKinney, one of Anderson's preferred constituents, as U.S. delegate to the new international organization. The treaty passed (although Knowland and Bricker tacked an amendment on the implementation clause which should hobble the powers of the organization), with Anderson's aid. Then the McKinney appointment was announced publicly.

The answer the party and Congressional leaders received — after this explanation was given in the White House meeting — was: "The deal is closed. Anderson delivered. We have to deliver with the McKinney appointment."

Proxmire: Wisconsin's Senator-elect William Proxmire will be heaped with favors by the Democratic Senate leadership, in an effort to help him win reelection next year after the end of his one-year term in office — so say veteran Congressional "staffers" who studied his reception when he came here to be sworn in as a member of the Senate. The leadership has already given him preferment in committee assignments (Post Office, Banking and Small Business), and may place him on the important Agriculture Committee sometime during the next session. And "slick dealer" Lyndon Johnson, Majority Leader, may obtain for him (by "arrangements" with the bureaucracy) legislative favors — such as placement of defense orders — calculated to inspire gratitude among Wisconsin constituents.

In any event, if first signs mean anything, the overburdened taxpayers (whose revolt brought in Proxmire) have no cause to rejoice. For, while the Democratic propaganda which attended Proxmire's appearance on the Senate floor was profuse, it included no mention of the new Senator's first legislative act.

Wisconsinites — watching the reception — had in mind that Proxmire, during his campaign, put himself on record in favor of reducing Federal expenditures.

Yet, the legislator cast his first vote to *increase* appropriations, not to reduce them. He voted in the affirmative to approve the joint House-Senate Conference report on the foreign-aid appropriations bill for fiscal year 1958.

This conference report reconciled conflicting stands by the House and Senate on the amount of the appropriation — the House for a lower figure, the Senate for a higher one. The Conference "split the difference," compromising on an in-between figure.

Thus, the conference reported a figure which *raised* the House appropriation figure on the three items of the bill, as follows: (1) defense support — $104 million more than the House voted; (2) military assistance program — $125 million more; and (3) special assistance program — $50 million more. In short, the new "economy" advocate from Wisconsin registered his first vote to increase the expenditure burden by a total of $279 million.

Civil Rights: "Who won the 'civil rights' battle?" is a question which receives few very firm answers in the Capital this week. In the aftermath of the long struggle — and in the light thrown on Southern determination to resist by the taut situation in Little Rock, Arkansas — analysts are marking down a great number of "losers," and no "winners."

To be sure, snap summaries have held that Lyndon Johnson, by steering the "civil rights" bill through to final victory, managed to ingratiate himself with both the North and the South — thus stealing a march towards the 1960 Presidential nomination. As more restrained counsel prevails, however, the outlook for Lyndon appears less hopeful. It will not be many months, analysts believe, before the South — ruminating the "civil rights" cud at greater length — will come to believe that Lyndon did to them what no "Yankee" could have done: maneuvered them out of filibustering, and into relatively docile acceptance of "civil rights." If Lyndon is tagged as a "Judas Goat" in Dixie, say the dopesters, he can bid his 1960 dreams goodbye.

On the Republican side of the picture, friends of Senator Knowland believe that he gained little or nothing from his performance in terms of "liberal" support, while offending many conservatives in the party who favor states' rights and dislike the Federal powers created by the bill.

For the GOP as a whole, ardent "civil rights" advocacy seems to have produced no appreciable effect on Negro sentiment. Observers monitoring the results of the recent Senatorial election in Wisconsin point to one particularly significant aspect of the vote: In the three heavily Negro wards of Milwaukee, the percentage of votes cast for the Democratic candidate rose sharply over the 1956 Senate contest. In last fall's election, the Democrats secured 61.6 per cent of the votes cast in these wards. But in the Kohler-Proxmire contest, 73.7 per cent of the votes went Democratic.

Budget Cutting: Ike's news-conference remarks minimizing this session's Budget cutting, say observers, amounted to complete defiance of the will of the people (although — they concede — in his ignorance of this and other legislative processes, he probably failed to realize it).

The President told reporters that, in making cuts in authorized spending programs, Congress was engaged in a "guessing game" — since it could not accurately estimate expenditures that would be incurred. Thus, he concluded, "we are compelled to go back in the spring and give them the deficiency that is incurred, and it must be paid." The same argument was at the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

root of Ike's other examples of appropriations cuts which he characterized as "eyewash."

What this argument really amounts to, say flabbergasted newsmen, is a bald declaration that the bureaucrats will refuse to pace their spending according to the intent of Congress and the people; and that — when they have used up their allotted funds — they will blackmail additional money from the legislators.

The President's argument, therefore, tended to discredit the Executive branch — especially the bureaucrats — rather than the Congress. Observers point out, in fact, that Senator Harry Byrd had countered this tactic even before Ike had a chance to execute it. In his statement released last week — estimating total cuts in new spending authority at $6.5 billion — Byrd stated:

"The President would be keeping faith with demand by the American public if he would require reduction in expenditures this year equal to the reduction in new spending authority, or more. . . . The people of this Nation are carrying a terrible burden of both debt and taxes. They deserve reduction in both."

Byrd concluded: "This requires expenditure reduction first. Appropriations have been cut. Expenditure reduction, under existing fiscal procedures, lies largely with the President."

It Can Be Done: One of the most encouraging stories to emerge from the Capital in recent days is that of the recent smashing, though unpublicized, victory won by conservative forces in the struggle over immigration. The story, as passed along by authoritative sources on the Hill, runs as follows:

Back in April, "hustlers" for "bigger and better immigration" were confident that they could rush through a series of amendments crippling the Walter-McCarran Act — attacking the "national origins" quota system and more than doubling the number of immigrants coming to this country annually.

At that time, Senator Eastland and Representative Walter privately confided that the possibility of heading off these amendments in their respective Judiciary committees was practically nil. The mass of the people, it seemed, were indifferent on the subject, and their representatives were therefore prepared to cultivate the prejudices of ethnic blocs in the big cities.

At this juncture, however, a number of patriotic groups and publications began to take alarm. One of the earliest shots fired in the conservative counterattack that ensued was an article in HUMAN EVENTS by Representative Walter ("The War Against our Immigration Law," April 20, 1957). Additional articles appeared in the *American Mercury*, the American Legion *Firing Line*, and in other publications. Patriotic groups such as the American Coalition, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Daughters of the American Revolution broadcast the news of what was brewing in Congress, and the people at the "crossroads" came alive.

A flood of protesting letters poured in on the legislators, and shocked some ardent immigrationists into realizing that minority ethnic blocs are not the only people who go to the polls. About 30 prominent patriotic figures, from all over the country, journeyed to Washington. After a thorough briefing on the legislative details of the amendments, they had face-to-face discussions with their members of Congress.

Under the impact of this grass-roots protest, such immigrationists as Senators Watkins and Dirksen changed sides completely, lending their weight to the noncontroversial bill originally passed by the Senate August 21 (allowing adopted orphans under 14 unlimited entry for two years, etc.), and by the House last week. Senate Democratic Leader Lyndon Johnson, who has long worked to "nibble away" at the immigration law, nimbly reversed himself and wrote constituents who besieged him with protests against weakening our immigration system: "I am opposed to all attempts to emasculate the Walter-McCarran Act."

The fact that the immigration onslaught was defeated, say Capital conservatives, shows that "it can be done." Communists, it is pointed out, have created over 200 separate organizations with the express purpose of destroying our immigration system. Yet this massive propaganda apparatus was knocked into the discard when conservatives began to mobilize. If conservatives stay alert, it is said, and continue to impress their sentiments on wavering legislators, the left-wingers will be similarly trounced each time they seek to win a legislative victory on this or other issues.

For America: Dallas and Fort Worth will be the host cities for a National Policy Committee meeting of "For America," and a statewide organizational rally of "Texans For America," September 19, 20 and 21. Former Utah Governor J. Bracken Lee, National Chairman of the patriotic group, will address the delegates. His topic: "What's Wrong With Being For America?"

Letter from O. GLENN SAXON, Professor of Economics, Yale University: "Since HUMAN EVENTS first became available, I have relied upon the honest, courageous and stimulating analysis of current political developments in Washington by the Editors of HUMAN EVENTS. No other publication has been so accurate and so fearless in its analyses."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
Bound Annual Volume with complete index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Event: The Coming Caesars

Reviewed by FREDERIC NELSON

In a new book called *The Coming Caesars* (Coward, McCann; $6), Amaury de Riencourt advances the theory, or at any rate puts new legs under an old one, that the American President is becoming a "tribune of the people," in the tradition of the Gracchi of republican Rome, and that the next step may well be frank acceptance of "Caesarism" as necessary in view of the world crisis. M. de Riencourt predicts that "growth of world empire that cannot be ruled by republican institutions, and the gradual extension of mass democracy, which ends in the destruction of freedom and in the concentration of power in the hands of one man," will be too much for our traditional balanced system.

Spengler, de Tocqueville and the late Irving Babbitt made similar predictions.

When you get to messing around with political diagnosis, you tend to pick evidence most favorable to the point you are trying to prove. F.D.R. was certainly a potential Caesar. Eisenhower doesn't look like one at all, although in certain lights he might double for one of *les frères* Gracchus if it wasn't for those rich golf partners. Nevertheless, some fairly substantial foundations for a future Caesar have been laid down by this Administration.

What, for example, were the Army-McCarthy hearings of 1953? Radio entertainment? A plot against an aggressively independent Senator? Defense of "human rights"? Or what? I suggest that the whole dreary affair boiled down to an attack by the Executive branch on the right of Congress to obtain information from the Executive upon its conduct of public affairs. The Executive won that battle and has since extended its lines so that it has become increasingly difficult for Congress to find out what goes on whenever an Administration official decides to clam up.

During the protracted McCarthy ruckus, the "liberal" press kept up a constant clamor the sense (if that isn't too complimentary an expression) of which was that the President should "assert his authority" and kick Senator McCarthy in the teeth. In other words, the Fourth Estate, which should have been yelling even louder than the Senator for identification of any pinkos in the Defense Department, went hell-bent for the dictatorial idea that Communist penetration of the military was none of Congress' business. The hungry sheep looked up, and were not fed.

In the Age of Jackson, reports M. de Riencourt, public opinion was "no longer the sober, informed opinion of a small, public-minded ruling elite, but a massive public opinion which swayed violently from indifference or downright apathy to extreme emotionalism, stirred by wild enthusiasm or wild fears."

Well, in the Age of Truman, we had a public opinion unable to note in the firing of General MacArthur for taking victory seriously anything more fundamental than a clash of personalities. And in the Age of Eisenhower, it was possible to waive the constitutional right of an American soldier in Japan with no better justification than the assumption that the humiliating deal was necessary to prevent our troops from being high-tailed out of Japan altogether. This seems about as unlikely an assumption as could be dreamed up, and its apparently wide acceptance must be explained by the popularity of the Caesarish notion that "Papa knows best." The abandonment of principle for expediency is an advanced symptom of the decay of popular institutions.

Of course our progress toward Caesarism is described by most people as progress toward greater freedom and liberty. The American people certainly won't accept dictatorship unless drugged, and we have enacted the Twenty-second Amendment to prevent any individual Caesar from operating for more than eight years. There have been "liberal" murmurings against even that restraint, which M. de Riencourt predicts will not dispel the threat of Caesarism any more than Sulla's limitation of all Roman offices to one year disposed of the dictatorial power of the tribunes. "Only human will can preserve liberty," declares M. de Riencourt. If "human will" is to be frittered away in efforts to force "integration" in schools and honky-tonks, or to destroy the whole structure of local authority in the name of "civil rights," the country could back into a sort of benign dictatorship while looking out the window.

It must be said for the President that he does balk at the role assigned to him when it becomes too preposterous – as when he annoyed his "liberal" friends by not looking happy when the double-dealing of the "civil rights" bill drafters was revealed to him. But the President's very popularity and reputation for honesty tend to step up rather than delay the stampede toward greater Executive power. Members of Congress who would fight Truman or Roosevelt to the limit, feel compelled to accept from Eisenhower proposals they would have opposed ten years ago. Resistance to a tyrannical curmudgeon is popular; not so popular is "obstruction" of the program of a tribune of the people.

To M. de Riencourt, we are indebted for a quotation from Cicero which certainly doesn't describe the American case now, but could if we don't pull up our socks: "It is due to our own moral failure and not to any accident of chance that, while retaining the name, we have lost the reality of a republic."

Frederic Nelson, a frequent contributor to HUMAN EVENTS, is an Associate Editor of the *Saturday Evening Post*.

All books reviewed or condensed in HUMAN EVENTS may be obtained, at the bookstore price, from The Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N.Y.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 36 HUMAN EVENTS September 7, 1957

Article Section II

THE COSTLIEST BINGE IN HISTORY

By JAMES H. WINCHESTER

THE BAR of the plush Hotel Nassauer Hof in Wiesbaden, Germany, was crowded. Above the bubbling chatter of the cocktail hour conversation, the shrill voice of a well-dressed, but no longer young, American girl cut like a sharp knife through the smoky atmosphere.

"I just hate the damned Germans!" she exclaimed. An hour or so later, having roundly condemned Germany and everything German, the girl reeled out of the hotel in an alcoholic fog. The fact that she was private secretary to one of the top American generals in U. S. Headquarters at Wiesbaden did not go unnoticed by the Germans present. It was a performance hardly designed to win respect — or friendship — for the United States.

If this scene were an isolated instance, it could be quickly dismissed. Unfortunately, it isn't unique. Alcoholism and sexual promiscuity are king-sized problems today in the ranks of the nearly 200,000 American civilians working full-time overseas for the U. S. Government. Along with this vast army of overseas clerks, secretaries and experts of one stripe or another, are another 125,000 wives and children. Add 200,000 dependents of U. S. military personnel and the total of nonuniformed Americans who have set up house overseas tops half-a-million.

Hitting the bottle, playing the sexual field and finding nothing good about anything anywhere are not the only faults of our civil servants and their dependents abroad. Most of them never bother to learn the local languages, study the culture of the land, or mix with the "natives," as they derisively refer to local residents. They stick together in self-contained "Little Americas," so isolated that they might be living in Baltimore rather than Bonn, in Topeka rather than Tokyo.

It is little wonder then that, despite the billions we've poured out in foreign aid in the last dozen years, many of our "friends" are no longer friendly. It is this resentment, directed mainly against the words and actions of our "Ambassadors of Ill Will," rather than at the Government and prestige of the United States itself, that culminates in today's growing wave of anti-American demonstrations in foreign lands.

The United States Government isn't exactly blameless, either, when it comes down to a hard analysis of this increasing unpopularity of Americans living overseas. Forgetting the fact that our military personnel is so far ahead of our allies in the pay scale — an American sergeant on Formosa, for example, makes several hundred dollars a month, with all allowances, while a Chinese colonel makes $20 a month — generous Uncle Sam spreads money around, in the form of bonuses and special allowances, among our overseas civil servants like it was going out of fashion.

WHAT GOES ON in London is typical. The cost of living there, on a permanent basis, is lower than it is here in the United States. Yet even a bottom-grade clerk gets $900 a year above salary for rent and another $120 a year to compensate for the "extra expense of living abroad." An employee with dependents can draw as much as $3,000 a year above his regular salary. Those in higher income brackets get proportionately larger allowances. Naturally, the Briton — who is considered well off if he earns $50 a week — does a slow burn when he sees Americans flashing such paychecks. Call it jealousy if you want to — the fact is it's still resented.

In Paris, according to a recent Congressional survey, a French stenographer working for an American agency earns considerably less than $2,000 a year, with no cost-of-living or special allowances. At the next desk, an American girl, doing the same type work, earns three or four times as much. In fact, the average U. S. Government stenographer earns as much as $6,000 a year abroad and many live — two and three together — in lavish quarters, with three or four servants.

The U. S. has spent, and is still spending, tens of millions to build fancy living quarters for civilians

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the payroll overseas. These "Little Americas" include supermarkets, fancy theatres, swimming pools, golf courses and other recreational facilities. In Bonn, for example, the U. S. Embassy housing development is referred to sneeringly by the Germans as the "Golden Ghetto."

We're not exactly cementing international relations — on a civilian level, anyway — by going into competition with local businessmen abroad, either. In Athens, for example, the U. S. Government runs free buses for Americans from suburban housing areas to downtown, competing with regular Greek operations. In Munich, Germany, there are 25 Government-run clubs open to U. S. civilians, all of them charging much less for food, drink and entertainment than German-owned and operated establishments.

American agencies and missions abroad are greatly overstaffed, too, by these civil service gravy-train riders, most of whom never had it so good. Senator Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina, who headed a Congressional group investigation of our Government personnel abroad, says flatly that at least half of the U. S. civilian employees overseas should be fired.

CONGRESS ITSELF, though, often sets a bad example. Among our "worst ambassadors" abroad are members of Congress and their staffs, who take advantage of their official positions to go junketeering around the globe — free-wheeling and free-loading — without any apparent constructive reason. One of the most widely played stories in the European and Far East press last year concerned the antics of a couple of gals on the staff of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Grace Johnson and Mary Frances Holloway. On several trips abroad, ostensibly to investigate the operations of the U. S. Information Service, they hardly endeared themselves or set an example for the American way-of-life. Accompanied by a 22-year-old ex-Senate page boy, who went along as their aide-de-camp, they cut a wide — and liquid — swath through the overseas Embassy circuit. The girls threw their weight around in the worst possible taste, according to all reports — a fact duly recorded in the foreign press, much to the ridicule of the U. S. and its policies.

In one Asian capital, where the U. S. has spent millions to win friends and firm up touchy relations, the two free-loading gals were guests of honor at a cocktail party, tossed by the local Embassy. Select local nationals were invited. So embarrassed were the American Embassy people by the loud and raucous conduct of these Congressional committee visitors that they cancelled all other parties scheduled for them during their stay. "These two women are the worst we've ever known," one U. S. Ambassador wrote to the State Department. As a result of such reports, the two women are no longer on the Government payroll.

Dr. Mottram Torre, a social psychiatrist who recently completed a survey on the performance and adjustment of American Government employes of the State Department, Technical Assistance and Military missions in Europe, Asia, South America and South Africa, has quite a few comments on this subject. "Many secretaries find adjustment abroad very difficult," Dr. Torre said in a recent speech at Syracuse University. "Unfortunately, one of the major motivations for applying for an overseas job is escape. Girls who have been unsuccessful in making a job or social adjustment at home feel that an overseas job may solve their problems. . . .

". . . There is another type that has been labeled the 'international tramp.' She finds glamor in overseas living, moves around in fast international circles, and knows all the ways of maneuvering with her Government status in relation to customs duties, currency manipulations and the like. She frequently plays the black market, brags of her exploits, drinks heavily, throws lavish and raucous parties, and is promiscuous. These activities are usually well known to the local population, and much of the adverse criticism of lavish overseas living of the United States staff is caused by her escapades."

(Copyright, King Features Syndicate, Inc.)

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "THE COSTLIEST BINGE IN HISTORY"

at $..... ☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15¢ (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½¢ per copy; for airmail, add 1¢ per copy.

Prices of 4-page articles or news sections are as follows: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 36 HUMAN EVENTS September 7, 1957

Article Section I

PORTENTS OF 1960: ONE MAN'S GUESS

By HOWARD BUFFETT

THE 1960 PRESIDENTIAL conventions are 36 months away. That seems far off to the average citizen, who holds the natural, yet now perhaps naive notion that choosing Presidential candidates and election are a process that begins and ends within the period of a few months.

Those with professional knowledge of politics, however, understand that the next 36 months are crucial. That explains why at least three apparent aspirants, Vice President Richard Nixon, Senator John Kennedy, and Senator William Knowland are working assiduously already. By campaigning now, these candidates hope to impress the ruling powers in their respective parties – the men who make the selections to be officially confirmed at the 1960 conventions.

The phrase "ruling powers" needs explanation. The charge of this discussion is that each major party contains a small group so powerful that it can and does determine who will be its party's nominee. In using the term "ruling powers," and in exploring this situation, no obloquy is expressed or implied. Our purpose is understanding, not condemnation.

While, in the past, American Presidential elections were probably free of oligarchic control, recent decades have recorded a significant shift. Before the New Deal, Federal patronage and spending powers were so small a part of American life that Federal influence was limited to small segments of our economy, plus a few special situations. With the Federal Budget spiralling from less than $3 billion in 1927 to over $70 billion 30 years later, all that is changed.

Federal intervention today reaches into almost every nook and cranny of state and local life, so that fantastic power now is possessed by those holding the reins of the Federal Government. That power is the most exciting prize in the world for ambitious men and groups. It is little wonder, then, that both parties are controlled by groups attracted to it like a bee to honey.

Who are these little groups of ruling powers?

In the Democratic party the voices of decision on the choice of a Presidential nominee come from an inner circle composed of a few labor leaders and big city political bosses in the more populous Northern states. Many bonds cement this alliance, but certainly the strongest is the gigantic Federal spending mechanism that stems out of global intervention – the militarism and internationalism that started with Lend Lease.

Before the Presidential conventions, this group will support delegates from their states who will carry out their instructions. Those chosen are either on a politically responsive payroll themselves, or other equally potent factors insure their obedience.

Southern Democratic delegates, who once held pivotal power in the Democratic party, bitterly resent this Northern control. But despite their unhappiness and dark mutterings, the South generally stays Democratic. The power its legislators hold in Congress by seniority right restrains effective rebellion.

IN THE REPUBLICAN party the "ruling powers" are not so clearly visible. Generally they are East Coast financial and business tycoons who, from behind the scenes, use ambitious party members to carry out their objectives. Internationalist in the extreme, this GOP ruling group seems to hold pivotal power in the field of modern mass communications, now a key weapon for political power.

While this group is harder to identify than its opposite number in the Democratic party, the unrestrained control it exercises seems to surpass that of the Democratic chieftains.

For example, there is no record that the Democratic high command ever tried to make a lifelong Republican its Presidential nominee. Yet the GOP power elite not only attempted the reverse of that tactic, but put it over in 1940 by nomination of Wendell Willkie, a lifelong Democrat. While this action had other apparent aims, its real purpose was to insure an internationalist in the White House. Both ruling groups have long collaborated on this goal, which comes ahead of party considerations. The East Coast Republican powers have demonstrated their continuing control in all succeeding GOP conventions. Only in 1952 did a serious challenge occur, when Senator Robert A. Taft made a vigorous fight for the Presidential nomination.

Taft came to the convention with an apparent clear majority of the delegates chosen in orthodox fashion. Even Arthur Krock, of the opposition *New York Times*, conceded that it was "probably true" that a majority of the delegates "vastly prefer Taft to Eisenhower as their national candidate."

Yet Taft was out from the start. The ruling group had many Taft delegates thrown out by unusual parliamentary tactics, and others reversed their pre-convention pledges to Taft after "vigorous persuasion."

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Delegate balloting was only a formality to report a fact already decided. Revered by the party rank and file as "Mr. Republican," Honest Bob left the convention stunned and defiled by trumped-up charges of corruption and vote-stealing.

In 1956 the GOP convention was apparently handled by emotional engineers from Madison Avenue. As would then be expected, that affair was run like a Hollywood production. Every delegate spoke and acted like he was directed except the sponsor of "Joe Smith." As he would not be regimented, he was thrown out.

We come now to the interesting and important question – what are the plans of the Democratic and GOP ruling groups for 1960? Who are the candidates or possible candidates that are acceptable to the groups we are discussing?

For the Democratic nomination a somewhat restrained prediction is offered – as when the weatherman, instead of predicting "Rain," says "Thundershowers in vicinity." The forecast here is that Senator John Kennedy, unless he stubs his toe badly, will get the Democratic Presidential nomination. As Senator Kennedy meets the requirements as far as militarism and internationalism are concerned, his prospects are good. Right here you might like to interrupt to exclaim, "But Kennedy is a Catholic! It would be the 1928 Al Smith campaign all over again."

And so it might be, if the GOP followed the pattern of the past. But suppose the Republican party also nominated a Catholic? Then what? If both parties nominated Catholics, wouldn't that take the religious issue out of the election, and heal up a rankling sore?

It may be that the East Coast GOP rulers have selected General Alfred Gruenther to be nominated at the Republican convention in 1960. Gruenther is an all-out internationalist, yet he was born and raised in the Middle West. This gives him the same qualities that were exploited so well in 1952. Gruenther combines brains with personality, and with the Cold War pitch still going strong, his military career could be a decisive advantage.

To balance this picture, he needs a civilian buildup such as General Eisenhower received as president of Columbia in 1949. With Gruenther getting that publicity buildup as chief of the American Red Cross, the "father image" propaganda for him can roll smoothly and unobtrusively.

While the Gruenther family are long-time Democrats, that fact is as unimportant as it was in the case of Willkie. Likewise General Gruenther is a Catholic. This factor, instead of handicapping him, might be useful.

ADMITTEDLY, THIS FORECAST is a long shot. But such an attitude may be what the ruling group wants and needs now. If general knowledge of a Gruenther nomination is deferred until the convention meets, the ruling oligarchy would avoid effective resistance to activating its program. Impetuous and disorganized eleventh-hour opposition would be quickly squelched.

It may be suggested that the Southern states would not accept this situation. Okay, what could they do about it? The time element of election laws would prevent a serious "third party" movement in many states. Yet even more effective in smothering any such effort could be charges of anti-Catholicism and Ku Klux bigotry.

With Kennedy on one ticket and Gruenther on the other, the Eastern internationalists could go fishing after the conventions, just as they have done since they chose Willkie in 1940.

With both candidates committed to internationalism and militarism, what would follow? The campaign and the election at the Presidential level would be, for the people, a popularity contest, and for the two major party ruling groups, a struggle over the levers of power. The policies of global intervention that are driving the world towards a triumph of tyrannical socialism everywhere would not even be discussed – nor could the people by their vote register opposition.

Whether the forecasts made here prove right or wrong, the situation facing the people is clear. Senator Richard Russell stated it plainly on July 22, 1957, when he declared:

"Both of the major parties are captives of a very small group within both parties that we might call rather extreme left-wingists. . . ."

Until that condition is changed, government by "consent of the governed" in America is in suspense. As 1960 approaches, this fact transcends all other problems facing the American people.

Mr. Buffett, a lifelong Republican, served four terms in Congress, representing the 2nd District of Nebraska. He retired voluntarily in 1952, and returned to private business. His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "Beware the Judas Goat," May 11, 1957.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "PORTENTS OF 1960: ONE MAN'S GUESS" at $..... ☐ Payment enclosed Bill me ☐

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15¢ (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½¢ per copy; for airmail, add 1¢ per copy.

Prices of 4-page articles or news sections are as follows: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED